

*REMARKS/ARGUMENTS*Overview

By this amendment, the applicants have incorporated into all rejected independent claims the subject matter of dependent claims previously indicated to recite allowable subject matter. Also, all indefiniteness rejections have been fully addressed by this amendment. Accordingly, applicants respectfully request that this amendment be entered and that the application be allowed at this time.

Claims 1-19 are presently pending in this application. Claims 11-18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the inventive subject matter. Claims 1-2, 8, 11-12 and 18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,983,686 to Lee, et al. (hereinafter “Lee”). Claims 5 and 15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Lee.

Applicants held a telephonic interview with the Examiner on November 27, 2006. Possible claim amendments for overcoming the grounds of rejection were discussed, as well as the status of claim 10 as an independent claim.

Claims 3 and 13 have been canceled.

Claims 1-2, 4-12 and 14-19 remain in this application.

The Examiner has indicated that claims 3-4, 6-7, 9-10, 13-14, 16-17 and 19 would be allowable if written in independent form including all limitations of their respective base claims and intervening claims, and if they were amended as necessary to overcome any rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112. Applicants are appreciative of the Examiner’s comments.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 11-18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the inventive subject matter. Applicants have amended claim 11 to address the Examiner’s rejection. By providing antecedent basis for the term “the slot” in claim 11, Applicants submit that they have

provided proper antecedent basis for that term for dependent claims 13-19. Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the § 112 rejection for claim 11, and for dependent claims 13-19 to the extent the rejection is based on these grounds.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-2, 8, 11-12 and 18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Lee. Claim 1 is an independent claim to an apparatus while claim 8 is dependent on claim 1. Claim 11 is an independent claim to a method while claim 18 depends on claim 11. Applicants have amended claims 1 and 11 to include a limitation that the case includes a rail, wherein the latch engages the rail. This limitation was previously included in dependent claims 3 and 13, which the Examiner indicated would be allowable if written in independent form to include all the limitations of their respective base claims (i.e., claims 1 and 11). Applicants submit that the inclusion of this allowable limitation places claims 1 and 11 in condition for allowance, and respectfully request withdrawal of the § 102 rejections for claims 1 and 11.

Because claim 8 depends on claim 1, it incorporates all its limitations, including the limitation as amended of an integrally formed latch. Similarly, claim 18 incorporate this limitation from claim 11. Thus, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the § 102 rejections for claims 8 and 18.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 5 and 15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Lee. Because claims 5 and 15 depend respectively on claims 1 and 11, they incorporate all the limitations of those independent claims. As discussed above, at least some of those limitations are not disclosed in the cited art. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the § 103 rejections for claims 5 and 15.

Allowed Claims

The Examiner has indicated that claim 10 would be allowable if written in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. However, claim 10 is itself an independent claim. In the telephonic interview with

the Examiner on November 27, 2006, the Examiner indicated the objection was in error, and that claim 10 should be allowed. Applicants appreciate the Examiner's retraction, and respectfully submit that claim 10 is in condition for allowance, and request that the Examiner allow claim 10 to issue.

Conclusion

Applicants respectfully submit that the patent application is in condition for allowance. If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of the subject application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

/Aaron R. Feigelson/  
Aaron R. Feigelson, Reg. No. 59,022  
LEYDIG, VOIT & MAYER, LTD.  
Two Prudential Plaza, Suite 4900  
180 North Stetson Avenue  
Chicago, Illinois 60601-6780  
(312) 616-5600 (telephone)  
(312) 616-5700 (facsimile)

Date: December 1, 2006